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OCTOBER 11, 2007, 2007
M O R N I N G S E S S I O N
(IN OPEN COURT)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

VOICES: Good morning.
THE COURT: Call the case, please.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL Number 1657, In re: Vioxx.
THE COURT: Would counsel make their appearance for the record.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, good morning, Judge Fallon. I'm Russ Herman for the plaintiffs.

MR. WITTMANN: Phil Wittmann. I'm counsel for Merck.
THE COURT: This is our monthly status conference. I have received from the committees their proposed agenda. We'll take them in the order presented. The State Court Trial Settings is the first item on the agenda.

MR. WITTMANN: Yes, Your Honor. Through March 31, 2008, we have the following matters set: We have the Record case set in the Florida Circuit Court of Palm Beach County is scheduled to run from December 10, 2007 to January 18, 2008.

In January 2008, the Turner case is set in the Alabama

Circuit Court for Bullock County, Alabama.
The Appell/Arrigale case is set for January 8, 2008, in the California Coordinated proceedings in the California Superior Court for Los Angeles County.

And the date of January 22, 2008, has been set in the New Jersey Coordinated proceeding for four trials with up to two to three plaintiffs in each trial.

On February 11, 2008, the Zajicek case is set in Jackson County, Texas.

And finally, on March 10, 2008, the Frederick case is set for trial in Jefferson County, Alabama.

THE COURT: Okay. The next item is Further Proceedings in the Early Trial Cases.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, the Barnett issue is pending. Notice of appeal has been filed by Merck. We have nothing further to report.

THE COURT: With regard to future federal cases, my thinking, as I mentioned to you, is next year we'll line up about five stroke cases. I'm going to give the plaintiffs the opportunity to pick the stroke cases so you should be thinking of those stroke cases.

Secondly, with the third-party payor cases, I've received an opinion from the Supreme Court of New Jersey which decertified the national class, so we're going to have to focus on those that are before this court, and my thinking is to try
one or more bellwether cases. If we can get by with one, that's fine; if we need a couple more to flesh out the whole thing, that's fine. Then I'll also be working on the remand motions. So 2008 hopefully will conclude my involvement in this case one way or the other.

MR. MARVIN: Your Honor, Douglas Marvin for the record. Your Honor, on the stroke cases, could we be heard on the selection process for the stroke cases?

THE COURT: Sure, I'll give you an opportunity, but that's my feeling. The reason for that is I think that in those particular cases, I consider those a little more problematic from the standpoint of the present state of the science as well as the law, and because of that, I think it would work best for the plaintiff to pick them, but I'll listen to you. I'll keep an open mind here.

MR. MARVIN: We'll try to submit a very persuasive motion on that.

MR. HERMAN: We'll try to oppose it just as persuasively, Your Honor.

With respect to, as Your Honor has indicated, a remand, Ms. Barrios has done an excellent job compiling her remands, and I understand there are 729 pending remands. We'll provide you, Your Honor, and defense counsel with the work product that Ms. Barrios has performed.

THE COURT: Also on that, Ms. Barrios, we had one that
was scheduled today. The person withdrew it but I would like to get some dates from him --

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Tommy Jacks is in the courtroom. He's the plaintiff's counsel.

THE COURT: I would like to get some dates that's convenient with your schedule and with the defendants and then I'll work it in, and we'll deal with it. I think that's one that we need to deal with.

MR. JACKS: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I would personally like to thank Mr. Jacks, who has been most helpful in the scheduling process. He will be reviewing the plaintiff trial package at Ms. Barrios' office today with representatives of the PSC, and the setting of that remand motion is very important.

In addition to that, I just want to, for the record, note that there is a case filed by the Attorney General of Louisiana, and we'll be asking the Court soon to look at remand in terms of that case.

THE COURT: And with regard to class actions, they can go one or two ways, and I need to focus a little bit on that. I'm not really rigid on it. I've already ruled that there is no national class action, but there is an issue of whether or not there are state class actions. I can do one of two things: I can deal with 50 state laws and make that decision, or I can send them back to their respective states to make that decision.

If I make the decision, it's difficult for me to just impose that on another judge in another area, so I probably, if I decide to make that decision, will have to also make myself at least available to that judge to try that particular class action wherever it may be going back to, if that's the situation, but I'm not there yet.

I don't know whether there is going to be any independent state class actions or not. If there are and I make the decision, I'm probably going to have to recognize that I'm going to have to go to the state and try those cases or at least make myself available, if they don't want me on it. Those are some of the issues that I'm going to have to deal with beginning next year.

Class Actions is the next one.
MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, you've got under advisement the defendants' Rule 12 motions to dismiss the master complaints for medical monitoring and money purchase claims, and that matter has been briefed and submitted to you.

There are two motions that need to be set for argument: One is the PSC's motion for leave to amend the personal injury and wrongful death second amended master class action complaint to add a plaintiffs' representative from Iowa, and defendants have filed a motion to strike the class action of the plaintiffs' medical monitoring master class action complaint. That matter
has been briefed, and we're awaiting a hearing date and have oral argument on that. And I think that's it on the class actions.

MR. LEVIN: Procedurally he has it right, Your Honor. Substantively there is a big difference.

THE COURT: Are we ready to argue those cases?
MR. LEVIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Then I'll be getting with you all and set some argument dates.

MR. LEVIN: Thank you.
THE COURT: The next item is Discovery Directed to Merck.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Actually item number 4, Discovery Directed to Merck, and Deposition Scheduling in connection with that, item number 6, if I might, I'll just discuss those very briefly together.

We recently received approximately a hundred thousand pages of deprivileged documents that would apply to the Reicin deposition which was previously set. I understand that representatives of the plaintiff and defendant have reached a mutual understanding on the taking of those deposition dates. They'll confirm something by letter.

So the question raised as to the moving of the dates is now moot, and in the event that we have another problem in terms of deprivileged documents coming in en masse, the plaintiff representatives and the defendant representatives will meet and
attempt to resolve those dates without the necessity of the court.

Having said that, I don't believe there is really a controversy now with respect to items four, Discovery Directed to Merck, and number 6, other than there has been a recent privilege ruling.

MR. WITTMANN: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I do appreciate the work that Professor Rice and Attorney Brent Barriere have been doing on this. As you all will recall, we originally had 30,000 documents containing some 500,000 pages. The Court reviewed the material. The Fifth Circuit asked that I re-review it.

I appointed Professor Rice, a well-known, wellqualified professor who specializes in privilege law to review a representative number of documents, and he was able to look at 2,000 documents which were representative of the first 30,000 documents, and he made recommended rulings on that.

I reviewed them and I accepted most of them. There were some of them that I reviewed and overruled, but substantially all of the documents were dealt with, the 2,000, and they were given back to Merck so that they could extrapolate from the 2,000 to the 30,000 documents. The 2,000 consumed about maybe 20,000 pages or thereabout. So they were able to work out the 30,000, another 30,000 documents and another 500,000 pages were presented, but that was able to be worked out also with the help of Professor Rice and Brent Barriere.

The next issue pertaining to privilege claims had to do with individuals who were third parties but were related in some way or at least hired by Merck in some way, and the question primarily was whether or not the privilege was waived, and if so, was the whole privilege waived or only partially waived. Those documents are now the subject of item 4 of the agenda, and they are also interfaced with item 6 that we talked about.

The Special Master has made some preliminary rulings and distributed them to the parties. I'm waiting for their input, and then I'll review the material and then make some final rulings on that. I do appreciate the cooperation of counsel as well as the splendid work of Professor Rice and Brent Barriere.

The next item on the agenda is --
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, just one matter with respect to the third parties and the rulings: We would anticipate that by the next scheduled status conference -- will come well after all of the briefing on those third-party issues and would attempt to discuss some scheduling for the next status conference.

With respect to the Plaintiff Profile Form, the Merck Profile Form, both sides have worked pretty hard at this. I've agreed to meet with a representative of the defense today and see if we can come to a final document to submit to the Court, and I'm hopeful we can resolve that issue.

THE COURT: Fine, I am also, because I think that both of you working at it will come up with a better product than I will because you're closer to it, but if you can't get it, then I would have the plaintiffs submit their proposal and the defendants submit their proposal, and I'll come up with the proposal. I really urge you all to see if you can come up with it. It will be in better form if you decide it than if I decide it.

MR. WITTMANN: I think you actually have the proposals, but notwithstanding that, we're still going to try to work it out so you don't have to make that decision.

THE COURT: The next item is Federal/State Liaison Committee.

MS. BARRIOS: Good morning, Your Honor, Dawn Barrios for the State Liaison Committee. I'm providing you today with some additional CDs that are comprehensive in nature. So that I don't feel like I'm bringing to the Court the last season of the Sopranos in a box set, we are going to convert next month's status conference to DVDs because then I only have to bring one. I cleared it with your law clerk yesterday to make sure that your chambers had DVD facilities, and I understand that they do, so I'm going to present the last box set of our last season to your law clerk.

THE COURT: Fine. I appreciate the work that you've been doing on this issue and also the patience of the state's claimants. I reviewed maybe a week ago the plaintiffs' trial
package. One of the responsibilities of the plaintiffs' committee, in addition to preparing and discovering the case, collecting documents and putting them in some form and fashion and organizing them so that they can be presented at trial, is to prepare a trial package.

That's an advantage of this format so that a trial package can be prepared, can be sort of canned, if you will, and sent back to the states so that anyone wishing to try the case will simply utilize the trial package and then, in addition, garnish it with some live witnesses, so to speak, to make it more presentable to a jury. I've reviewed the trial package in camera with the plaintiffs' committee. It will be very helpful, is very well prepared, and I feel that the states will benefit from it.

That's one of the reasons that I've been reluctant to send cases back or to focus on the remand, because they would only have access to a portion of the trial package perhaps or maybe none of it, and I wanted them to go The Full Monty on this, so to speak, and I think that they now have it available to them, so I will be focusing on the remand motions for the plaintiff.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor. We did communicate with all the states' attorneys via electronic newsletter after the last status conference, and I received many calls and return e-mails, "Hallelujah, the trial package is finished." So I'll just wait and work with Mr. Herman when that would be available. Your Honor, just to refer back to the document that I
had prepared and Mr. Herman had remarked, I just wanted to bring to your attention, the last two pages are the statistics breaking down the 729 remands. There are, Your Honor, 10 cases that are up on second remands. They have been removed, remanded, and removed again. And I know you said you would turn your attention to those.

Those 10 cases are contained on a separate CD-ROM for Your Honor's viewing pleasure that when you address the issue of remand, I think it would be appropriate to address these 10 that are here on a second remand.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. BARRIOS: Your Honor, lastly, I do have another case with an ill plaintiff that has been brought to my attention. The case name is Lewis Montgomery versus Merck. It's case number 205-01176. And I've been in touch with plaintiff's counsel just late yesterday afternoon. He's in trial today, so I'm going to work with him, but he asked that I bring that case to Your Honor's attention.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You bet.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with respect to a trial package issue, I talked with Shellie and members of the committee, and they are accelerating their work on the stroke package, and we hope before the next status conference, we could come to you to
say that it's well along.
In addition, to that, I think it's important to again acknowledge Mr. Jacks on the record. There are not many trial lawyers in this country that aren't aware of his professionalism and abilities, and the PSC particularly wants to thank him for his cooperation. This is the third or fourth time he's left an important matter in progress to appear, and I'm very anxious to get a date for remand.

THE COURT: The next item is Pro Se Claimants.

MR. HERMAN: There is really no new issue on that,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: IMS Data.

MR. HERMAN: There is really no new issue on that,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: Eleven is Merck's Motion For Summary Judgment.

MR. WITTMANN: Your Honor, I think you have under consideration the certification of --

THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Wittmann, I can't quite hear you.

MR. WITTMANN: I said you have under submission now our motion for certification for interlocutory appeal on the preemption issue.

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, you know we're involved in discovery with regard to compliance with the executive order.

We'll be filing discovery shortly against the FDA on that issue.
THE COURT: And you're feeling still is that it's not ripe for argument at this time?

MR. LEVIN: That's correct, sir.
THE COURT: Tolling Agreements.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor -- I'm sorry, Phil. Excuse me. Your Honor, we were advised this morning by liaison counsel that recently in Mississippi, Mr. Tyner, in federal court has filed over a thousand cases, bundled them, and they will be coming here, and Your Honor has a process for unbundling those. We wanted to alert the Court, both sides, so the Clerk's Office will be alerted that they are in the pipeline.

THE COURT: That's a problem that not only the Clerk's Office of this court but clerk's offices for courts throughout the country that are dealing with MDLs are having. The question of filing of one case and then attaching or joining another thousand cases to that case presents some problems logistically.

I don't want to create a problem with prescription for the other 999 cases, but at the same time, it gets really problematic when one case is filed and 999 are joined to it, because those 999 don't have a docket number, and then as the time goes by, some of those cases are dismissed, some of those cases are abandoned, some of those clients wish to get out, and there is no docket number, and then to go back in and try to find
them presents some logistical problems.
So the best way of doing it, I think, is to file individual cases, and that seems to be the consensus of courts in the country. I'm looking at that.

MR. WITTMANN: One other thing on the tolling agreements, Judge: We're continuing to work with the PSC on a stipulation that will let the claimant profile forms that have been filed with the tolling agreements be converted to a PPF through an addendum. We haven't gotten there yet, but we're still working on it.

THE COURT: I think that's the solution, frankly, so that those individuals don't have to redo what they have already done. Next time I think it would be helpful to keep that in mind when that type of material is being filed. Let's get the PPF filed with the tolling agreements since you know it's going to be used in the future.

I think tolling agreements are helpful in this type litigation. I think it does work, and I don't think that the bundling has worked either for this district or for other districts that I am aware of, but I totally agree they serve a purpose.

Issues Relating to Pretrial Order Number 9 is item 13. Is there anything on that?

MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You've received some agreement now from the

Texas MDL, and I know we have some from California and New Jersey.

Vioxx Suit Statistics, is there anything on that?
MR. WITTMANN: There hadn't been any change since the last -- I think we have new results. New statistics will be out October 15th.

MR. HERMAN: Except for the thousand or so numbers added to the 23,450 now pending in the $M D L$, I don't think they have been included.

THE COURT: As I understand it, those were filed in federal court in Mississippi, and so we are going to be seeing them shortly.

MR. WITTMANN: Yes.
THE COURT: Merck's Insurance.
MR. HERMAN: No further issue on that today, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And 16 is Motion to Conduct Case Specific Discovery.

MR. HERMAN: I would like that matter just held over to the next status conference, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The next, item 17 is Oxford/VICTOR Data.
MR. HERMAN: We have an agreement with defense counsel that when they receive additional materials from Oxford, we'll get them. We haven't received additional materials, but I'm certain that defense counsel will forward them when they receive them.

MR. WITTMANN: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And the next item we have is the MDL Trial Package we talked about already.

Some items that I'm going to be focused on and will be putting out a minute entry shortly on it is the Court's ruling in the O'Brien case and whether or not I should certify for immediate appeal the issue of whether state procedural law or federal procedural law is to be used for dealing with the substitution of an estate.

I held that it should be federal law because it's procedural in nature, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should apply. I'm now being asked to certify that particular question. I'll be denying that request, but I'll do it in a minute entry.

The Duly case -- there were two suits filed, one in Colorado, one in Minnesota. The case involves an individual who lives in Colorado, took medication in Colorado, has a treating physician in Colorado. His attorney, however, lives in Minnesota, and there are two suits. One filed in Minnesota; one filed in Colorado. The same suit, just two places, and a decision has to be made as to which one should be the one and the other one be dismissed.

I'm inclined to dismiss the Minnesota case, assuming that there are no prescriptive problems. I don't want the party to be disadvantage with prescription, but if there are no
prescription problems, I will be doing that.
Ms. Joan Petty (spelled phonetically), who is a pro se claimant, has filed a RICO claim. I've separated that and made that a separate claim. I've looked at the material, and it seems to me that it does not satisfy the requirements of RICO. I will be dismissing that RICO claim.

An issue that I'm trying to deal with is this: I'm getting a number of motions from attorneys wishing to withdraw from the case. I don't want the litigants to be disadvantaged by the attorneys withdrawing and the litigants not having any representation. On the other hand, attorneys can't be asked or required to stay in a case when they try repeatedly to find their client and their client has either abandoned the case or is no longer interested in pursuing it but will not communicate with them. I'm trying to deal with it in some way that protects the litigant and also recognizes the insurmountable problem of the attorney in that circumstance.

And we have also some dismissals of PPF, but I'll deal with that shortly.

The next meeting will be on November 9th. I'll meet with the committees at 8:30, and we'll begin this meeting at 9 o'clock. Anything from anyone either on the committee or in the audience?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, would it permissible for Mr. Jacks and Ms. Barrios to meet with someone from your office
to look at schedules?
THE COURT: That's fine. And also maybe someone from the defendant so that we can coordinate some dates. I would like to pick a date, and I'll set it on a time that nothing else is taking place so that we'll focus on it and deal with it.

MR. WITTMANN: We have nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Becnel has a comment.
MR. BECNEL: I've been behind the striping machine, Your Honor, on the bridges putting new lines down, but I've been listening on the phone.

But in any event, I read the recent articles in the ADA journal this month dealing with the costs of this kind of litigation. And I'm very concerned when you brought up just a minute ago, you know, $\$ 350$ per person to file. A lot of people can't do that, and a lot of lawyers, with the cost of these trials, to both sides, you know, costing two to three million dollars a pop to try, are we going to just price all of these people out of the civil litigation?

THE COURT: That's a legitimate question, and that's why my first reaction was to allow it because it just seemed to me that it was problematic or difficult to have some people put out \$300. Someone who is filing a thousand cases, that's $\$ 300,000$. That's a problem, and I frankly don't have an answer to it, but it's creating logistical problems that are insurmountable.

New Jersey I've talked with. They've gone the way of
individual filings. So have a number of other states in the federal system. I frankly don't know what to do with it. It's a problem, though, and I recognize the problem.

MR. BECNEL: And, Your Honor, what I'm really concerned about is people with large inventories. Up to this time, almost every member of the PSC can afford to file their cases, but a lot of people that have 20 or 30 cases that don't have the finances that these people do, they're priced out of the marketplace and, you know, it's just not fair. I don't know what the answer is, other than doing eight or ten or twelve. For example, if you want me to start trying my cases and I got to do them one at a time, you and I will be dead before I get to the end.

So I would suggest big groups of cases. I've been suggesting that since the inception of this case, because I thought one-at-a-time cases are going nowhere, no matter where they are. It brings down the cost, and that's what the Supreme Court seems to be talking about and the ABA seems to be talking about, how to bring down the costs to make it cost effective.

The trial package that the PSC has put together is wonderful, but if you're doing it even with that, it's going to cost two or $\$ 300,000$ a case, and let's say a case is only worth $\$ 100,000$.

THE COURT: Well, the problem that presents is a lot of times a lot of things that happen happen as a result of abuses of
the system. A person who packages a number of cases that are good cases which have been screened and are significant cases is one thing. Oftentimes, lawyers -- I'm sure no one in this room or on the phone -- but there are some lawyers who simply say, Well, let's file a number of them. It's easier. It's cheaper. We'll take one that is really a good case, and then all the rest, the 999 or whatever it is we're not sure about, we don't have time to deal with them at this time but we'll put them in the pleading, and since it doesn't cost anything, let's just put them in. And that unfortunately brings the issue that all of you-all are dealing with. It's an abuse of the system that creates the problem.

Also, costs in MDL cases concerns me with the discovery. That's why I tried to do it myself first, because it was just cheaper for the litigation and cheaper on the litigants. So I took two weeks out of my life to do it, and I worked about 10 hours a day looking at those documents, but it's difficult for a court to shut down for two weeks and do that sort of thing.

So when the Circuit suggested I do it again, I couldn't give another two weeks. I just couldn't do it. I had too many cases on my docket, so I needed some outside help. We hired or you hired, you meaning the litigants hired at my request or suggestion or order, Professor Rice. It's costing hundreds of thousands of dollars to deal with this discovery issue, but how do you deal with 500,000 documents or a million documents now
with the court system? You can't look at those numbers of documents.

My concern, just institutionally, is that I'm hearing comments about the way to do it is to do away with privilege, to do away with the attorney-client privilege, and that's a difficult thing for lawyers to deal with. We have one of the oldest privileges in the law, the attorney-client privilege, and that's in jeopardy now because of the problems that mass cases like this present.

Cost is another issue. When it's abused and then the cost is focused on, some people say, Well, let's do away with the vehicle. Some claim that the class action vehicle doesn't work anymore. The MDL vehicle doesn't work anymore. That's the problem that's presented, and it's a difficult issue.

I'm aware of the point you raise, and I don't have an answer to it. It's just that I don't know how you deal with it when you have a thousand cases, and one is a good case, and 80 percent of them withdraw after a while, and it presents problems for everybody. I don't know what you do with that.

MR. BECNEL: Judge, the other thing is if we start dealing with preparing forma pauperis petitions here, that's twice as difficult for the Clerk's Office and the contesting of whether that person is truly a pauper or not. We deal with that quite a bit in the state courts, not very much in the federal courts.

But I think there ought to be something in all of the meetings with the various MDL judges to address these issues because, you know, I just don't think, like in the Katrina litigation, if I had to take the 71,000 clients that I have and file an individual lawsuit for them, I would either have to tell them, See you later, Get you somebody else. And they couldn't pay, so what do we do?

That's a typical example of most of these people who have had heart attacks or had strokes. They've lost their jobs. They are barely hanging on to their homes or whatever they have. It's issues that we have got to address as a society, not just as lawyers.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you for your comments.
MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I want to thank Mr. Becnel, who has provided very recently the PSC two articles indicating the deficiencies of the FDA, and they've been forwarded to our preemption committee.

Secondly, I'm not going to elaborate, but, again, it just points out that individual due process has been sacrificed at the altar of corporate due process, because I think Mr. Becnel is right. Individuals just don't have the power to bring their cases forward absent a realistic class action mode. We all know and would have to admit under current law, it's almost impossible to certify a personal injury case, so what do those
injured people do? At any rate, when Mr. Becnel is right, he's right, and I will say that on the record.

THE COURT: We will have to have a seminar devoted to philosophy.

MR. WITTMANN: I'm not going to take the time of the Court to rebut this but suffice it to say, we believe defendants are entitled to due process too.

MR. LEVIN: Just some defendants, not --
THE COURT: On that note, everybody's entitled to due process. Court will stand in recess.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.
(WHEREUPON, the proceedings were concluded.)
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